

# EXHIBIT HHH

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF HAWAII

WAYNE BERRY, a Hawaii  
citizen,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HAWAII EXPRESS SERVICE,  
Inc., a California  
corporation, et al.,  
Defendants.

CIVIL NO. 03-00385SOM-LEK

Honolulu, Hawaii

October 11, 2005

10:57 a.m.

DEFENDANTS MARK DILLON,

TERESA NOA, MELVIN PONCE,

SONIA PURDY, JUSTIN

FUKUMOTO, ALFREDDA

WAIOLAMA & JACQUELINE RIO'S

MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

ON DAMAGES

DEFENDANT PCT'S MOTION

FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY

JUDGMENT ON DAMAGES

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE SUSAN OKI MOLLWAY,  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

TIMOTHY J. HOGAN, Esq.

Lynch Ichida Thompson Kim

& Hirota

1132 Bishop Street, Ste. 1405

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

For Defendant  
Post-Confirmation Trust  
for Fleming Companies,  
Inc.:

LEX R. SMITH, Esq.

ANN C. TERANISHI, Esq.

First Hawaiian Center

999 Bishop Street, Suite 2600

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

ERIC C. LIEBELER, Esq.

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

777 South Figueroa Street

Los Angeles, California 90017

For Defendants Dillon,  
Noa, Ponce, Purdy,  
Fukumoto, Waiolama & Rio:

LYLE S. HOSODA, Esq.

RAINA P. B. MEAD, Esq.

Lyle S. Hosoda & Associates, LLC

345 Queen Street, Suite 804

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

1

2

3

4

Official Court Reporter:

Cynthia Tando Fazio, RMR, CRR  
United States District Court  
P.O. Box 50131  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings recorded by machine shorthand, transcript produced  
with computer-aided transcription (CAT).

1 in the record, a quote: You want to change my software, this  
2 is what it's going to cost you. That's an issue of fact as to  
3 whether what they're claiming, \$100, which is what they got  
4 from somebody who's paying Mr. Berry a lot of money to use the  
5 software legally.

6 THE COURT: Okay. First of all, if I entered judgment  
7 against the defendants jointly and severally for any amount,  
8 they are not the prevailing party. So I don't understand how  
9 they're going to seek attorney's fees.

10 If you seek attorney's fees, then even if you get an  
11 award of attorney's fees it's going to be reasonable attorney's  
12 fees. And if your award is, for example, \$30,000, I don't  
13 know, you're going to have a great time establishing that, you  
14 know, half a million dollars is a reasonable attorney's fee for  
15 a \$30,000 award. I mean I think that's a pretty tough row to  
16 hoe.

17 Now, you can take me up on appeal. If I get reversed,  
18 you come back down, you ultimately win a million dollars.  
19 Well, obviously you're going to be in a different posture then  
20 and, you know, no doubt your fees will stretch back even to  
21 these proceedings that have preceded today.

22 I'm not saying I'm going to rule yet, but I'm just  
23 trying to understand how the process will unfold as we go on  
24 depending on how I rule. And, you know, some of the things  
25 that you just said do not seem to me to follow logically from

1 your concern that I will grant their motion if the ultimate  
2 order is that your damages are either 16-8 or 30,000. I don't  
3 see this parade of horrors on attorney's fees frankly.

4 MR. HOGAN: Well, I've been through this once before  
5 on the same issue of election right and during a trial, Your  
6 Honor, and the case law is very clear that the simple fact of  
7 election and the diminished amount that you get should not  
8 be -- I can't remember the Ninth Circuit case, but the court  
9 has spoken as saying that that is not relevant. It's --  
10 copyright is a special place and because of difficulty in  
11 damages and whatnot that the courts have generally looked at  
12 this not as a sort of a pro rata or percentage kind of thing  
13 but basically look at what the case was about and --

14 THE COURT: Okay. I --

15 MR. HOGAN: So that's why --

16 THE COURT: I'll grant you that. I mean I'll grant  
17 you that in most intellectual property cases the money damages  
18 do not fully reflect the value of a judgment that a plaintiff  
19 obtains and that the more valuable portion of the judgment is  
20 the injunction.

21 And so I agree with you that the money damages that  
22 somebody obtains may be, you know, far outstripped by the  
23 attorney's fees that were spent in the course of getting a very  
24 valuable injunction. But there isn't an injunction here  
25 because I found that they aren't using this -- this program

1 anymore and haven't been for sometime. So -- so that the  
2 recover -- the value of any judgment you get is going to be  
3 your money damages and that's -- my guess is that if we look at  
4 these copyright cases that you're referring to in the Ninth  
5 Circuit, that there was an injunction involved of some value  
6 and that is what may lead a court to enter an attorney's fee  
7 order that is many times -- many multiples of the money  
8 judgment award. But that's not what we have here.

9 MR. HOGAN: Well, Your Honor --

10 THE COURT: You know, there's not an attorney fee  
11 motion in front of me. I'm just -- I'm just saying that this  
12 parade of horrors is not scaring me too much even though you  
13 tried it out.

14 MR. HOGAN: Your Honor, as to the injunction they  
15 still got copies of Mr. Berry's work. He's -- he's entitled to  
16 an order of destruction and return. That's -- that's -- that's  
17 still live in this case. There's been no termination of that  
18 possession. There's no right to see and has to possess his  
19 works. Perhaps if you want to keep then in an attorney's lock  
20 box for litigation purposes, that's what the courts earlier  
21 ruled. But CNS was delivered multiple copies of the work and  
22 somebody has to deal with that. I don't know what will -- what  
23 it'll do, it'll just engender more litigation.

24 THE COURT: Okay. As I understand it, the copies they  
25 have, have been retained for litigation purposes, not for use.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, CYNTHIA TANDO FAZIO, Official Court Reporter,  
United States District Court, District of Hawaii, Honolulu,  
Hawaii, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1  
through 47 is a correct transcript of the proceedings had in  
connection with the above-entitled matter.

DATED at Honolulu, Hawaii, November 14, 2005.

  
CYNTHIA TANDO FAZIO, RMR, CRR